

4-11-1982

# University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, May 11, 1982

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 1982 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents](http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents)



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

*Let us know how access to this document benefits you*

---

## Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, May 11, 1982" (1982).  
*Faculty Senate Documents*. 381.

[http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/381](http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/381)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@uni.edu](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

Senate Minutes

May 11, 1982

1300

1. Remarks from Vice President and Provost Martin.

CALENDAR

2. 319 Report of the Committee on Admission and Retention (memo and report from Juanita Wright, Chair, dated April 28, 1982). Approved placing this report in the Minutes.
3. 320 Preliminary Report of the EOP Evaluation Team. Approved placing at the head of the docket out of regular order. Docket 261.
4. 321 Application for Emeritus Status. Approved to docket for consideration at today's meeting in executive session. Docket 262

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

5. 322 Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Inflation (letter and report from Dr. Bruce Rogers, dated April 30, 1982). This item will be considered for docketing at the Senate's first meeting during the fall semester.

DOCKET

6. 320 261 Preliminary Report of the EOP Evaluation Team. No action taken.
7. 321 262 Application for Emeritus Status. Approved emeritus status for Professor of Teaching, Mary Ann Jackson.

The University Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:18 p.m., May 11, 1982, in the Board Room by Chairperson Davis.

Present: Abel, Baum, Cawelti, D. Davis, J. Duea, Erickson, Glenn, Hallberg, Heller, Hollman, Millar, Noack, Remington, Richter, Sandstrom, Story, TePaske, Yager (ex officio)

Alternates: Cooney for Geadelmann

Absent: J. Alberts

Members of the press were requested to identify themselves. Mr. Tom Hansen of the Waterloo Courier, Mr. Trace Regan of Channel 7 television, Ms. Debbie Blakely of the Northern Iowan, Ms. B. T. Huntley of the Cedar Falls Record, Mr. Al Schares of the Northern Iowan, and Mr. Jack Hovelson of the Des Moines Register, were in attendance.



1. Vice President and Provost Martin addressed the Senate. Dr. Martin reported that a recommendation for the position of Dean of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts was ready to be made to the Board of Regents and that the faculty of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts had been notified. No public announcement will be made prior to Board action. He also indicated that the search process for the Dean of the College of Extension and Continuing Education was in its final stages. Dr. Martin indicated he expected a recommendation to be made for an appointment at the June Board meeting.

#### CALENDAR

2. 319 Report of the Committee on Admission and Retention (memo and report from Juanita Wright, Chair, dated April 28, 1982). See Appendix A.

Remington moved, Hollman seconded to place the report of the Committee on Admission and Retention into the Minutes of the University Faculty Senate. Motion passed.

3. 320 Preliminary Report of the EOP Evaluation Team.

Duea moved, Hollman seconded to place at the head of the docket out of regular order. Motion passed. Docket 261.

4. 321 Application for Emeritus Status.

Hollman moved, Richter seconded to docket for consideration at today's Senate meeting. Motion passed. Docket 262.

#### OLD/NEW BUSINESS

5. Chairperson Davis indicated he had just received calendar item 322 and he suggested that the Senate carry this item over for consideration and possible docketing at the Senate's first meeting during the fall semester.

It was moved and seconded to consider this item for possible docketing at the Senate's first meeting during the fall semester. Motion passed.

#### DOCKET

6. 261 Preliminary Report of the EOP Evaluation Team.

Chairperson Davis indicated that it was perhaps inappropriate that the title of this item be considered "Preliminary Report." He indicated that this draft would be given to Professor Rider, who in turn would give the draft copy to Vice President Martin. Chairperson Davis indicated that when the final report was available it would be distributed to members of the Faculty Senate, UNISA, and to the administration. It is expected that the administration will respond to the Senate during the fall semester on any proposed action contained in the final report.

Senator Remington pointed out that in Article F of the Hallberg-Remington proposal that a preliminary report was to be distributed to members of the administration and the Faculty Senate. Chairperson Davis indicated that circumstances prevented such a report being made and that as of yet the administration had not received this draft copy.



Dr. Rider indicated that the preliminary report is actually a rough draft of the final copy. He indicated that members of the team do not consider it to be a preliminary report. He indicated that members of the team felt that to make recommendations without the appropriate rationale would not be helpful to the situation.

Senator Remington inquired if the team chose not to make a preliminary report. Dr. Rider responded in the affirmative.

Dr. Rider introduced Dr. Robert Carter, who is a member of the evaluation team who was here to respond to any questions that the Senate might have.

Dr. Rider made the following report to the Faculty Senate.

#### Review of Evaluation Procedures

These are the procedures that have been followed in this evaluation:

On January 25, 1982, the University Faculty Senate considered and passed a procedure for an academic evaluation of the Educational Opportunity and Special Community Services Program, based upon the Remington-Hallberg report. The report also referred to certain allegations of a legal nature that were not in the province of the faculty. In regard to these allegations, separate investigations by the State Auditor's Office and the Department of Criminal Investigation are still in progress.

I was asked to serve as the EOP Evaluation Facilitator on February 18, 1982 and agreed to do so. This was announced to the Senate on February 22, 1982. On that date, the Senate approved a modified screening procedure for candidates for the evaluation team.

This screening procedure was utilized and was completed by March 11. During the week of Spring Break, I proceeded to contact individuals from among a list of twenty-eight names that survived the screening process.

On March 22, 1982, I announced to the Senate the make-up of the evaluation team. This included Dr. Robert Carter, Director of the Educational Program for the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, Dr. Clarence Shelley, Dean of Students at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, and Professor Jack Kirkland, Professor of Social Work at Washington University in St. Louis. They tentatively agreed to an on-campus visitation the week of April 12 through 19.

During March, I had meetings with Vice President Martin and Dean Glenn Hansen to work out details of the evaluation process. I corresponded with President Kamerick and the university attorney in regard to certain aspects of the evaluation.

On March 24, I sent a memo to Vice President Martin and Norris Hart asking their views regarding the kind of input that each felt would be appropriate for the evaluation. On March 26, I sent a memo to Rusty Martin, President of UNISA, asking his assistance in identifying students and/or student groups interested in providing input to the evaluation.

I also consulted by phone with certain faculty members and students in an effort to receive guidance as to what kind of input would be most useful in the evaluation effort. A memo was sent to the University Faculty on April 7 requesting input for the evaluation.

Through this process and based upon my judgment of the situation, I arranged a schedule for the campus visit which took place on April 13th through 16th. Prior to the visit, the self-study by the EOP staff was completed on April 1 as was the report on the academic performance of students in the program over a ten-year period. These were sent to the team on that date (by air-freight) and were in their hands on April 2. The student opinion survey was finished by April 12 and was given to the team upon their arrival on April 13.

(continued)

Team members made preliminary contact with one another during the weekend of April 3 and 4, and were in phone contact during the week prior to their visit.

I have reported to you previously about the nature of the on-campus visit in which many individuals met with the team and supplied information for the evaluation.

Subsequent to the visit, the team has received additional information from me, from Norris Hart and his staff, from Vice President Stansbury, and from Vice President Hansmeier.

The team met in Normal, Illinois on April 30th and May 1st to discuss their views and finalize their recommendations. Dr. Carter agreed to bring the results of that meeting together into a report. He completed a preliminary version of the report yesterday and has traveled to Cedar Falls today to deliver the report to me and to visit further with certain individuals regarding the EOP situation.

Throughout this past two months, I have had numerous contacts with the team over the phone regarding the evaluation and its progress.

This is a brief overview of the events associated with this evaluation.

#### Comments About the Evaluation Team

It is my opinion that we have been fortunate to have had the services of the three individuals on the evaluation team. They are dedicated professionals who have brought much experience and background to this significant task. Through their professionalism, commitment to minority education, attention to detail, sensitivity to individuals, dedication to seeking facts, and willingness to commit to many hours of hard work, they have served us well.

The results of their efforts is an evaluation that has the necessary credibility to bring about needed changes in the program. Their credibility is further exemplified by the fact that each has indicated to me a continuing interest in this matter and its eventual resolution. They wish to remain in contact with us and to be available for further consultation and assistance.

#### Comments on the Philosophical Basis of the Evaluation

In regard to this matter, I discussed the general nature of the problems associated with the program with the team. I supplied them with representative newspaper clippings and other information in order to acquaint them with the public context of the matter.

In my preliminary phone conversations with the team and during our initial working session prior to the meetings on campus, I reviewed some of this information with them. The consensus that we arrived at was that the academic evaluation effort should be aimed at attempting to identify the problems and their causes in order to provide a thrust toward improving the situation. We shared the view that programs such as the one that was to be evaluated represent important efforts, nationwide, in the area of minority education that should be protected and improved in order to meet definite social needs in the society.

This positive and constructive approach, we felt, was in keeping with the commitment that the faculty and university made over a decade ago in the area of minority education.

I mention this to make it clear that nothing in this evaluation has been aimed at elimination of the program. While such a possibility always exists, the team would regard this as most unfortunate and highly undesirable.

#### Comments about Personnel

It is clear that many of the perceived problems associated with the EOP Program have been identified with specific individuals involved in the program. Much of the publicity about the problems in the program has been concerned with certain individuals. The team received information regarding personnel matters from a number of individuals during the on-campus visit and has had to deal with this in the process of evaluating the program.

Due to the need to protect the rights of individuals, it is not appropriate to discuss situations associated with specific personnel in public. Indications of concerns by the team regarding the program will be made to the appropriate administrative officers.

Hopefully, all who are interested in this matter will understand this situation and recognize the need to protect individual rights.



(continued)

#### General Comments

This evaluation and the circumstances surrounding it present a serious and challenging situation to the University of Northern Iowa. Public disclosure of certain information related to problems within the EOP program has served to call into question the ways in which the university operates in the minds of many. The public's perception of what all of this means is critical to the well-being of our institution. Whether or not the reporting and editorial comments about the situation have been totally accurate, the questions and doubts that the public may have about us because of what they have heard must be of great concern to us.

Public confidence in an institution such as the University of Northern Iowa results when our programs are perceived to have academic integrity and to be administered in a competent manner. This applies to all programs. The greatest thing that we have to protect and maintain is our academic integrity. This can only happen if we have effective leadership, both in terms of the administration and the faculty.

That leadership must function to ensure that programs meet standards consistent with the best we have to offer. The mission of the university is the education of its students and every effort must be made to provide effective programs that meet the needs of those students. The quality of any given program can be a subjective measure that may reflect the realities of that program. There will always be room for improvement in our efforts and it is the responsibility of leadership to be diligent and aware of potential problems that work against the goals of any of our programs. If the leadership is not responding to this responsibility in an effective manner, it is imperative that appropriate measures be taken to provide means by which changes can occur to bring about resolution of problems. Hopefully, this evaluation will provide a means to address and correct problems associated with the EOP Program.

The thrust of the evaluation effort has been toward identifying the problems and developing recommendations that will serve to assist in solving the problems. Hopefully, the results of the evaluation have identified the problems and offer meaningful ways to deal with them. If the recommendations are successfully implemented and problems are resolved, this will serve to restore public confidence in this as well as other programs at the university.

A question that we must also be asking ourselves is why have these problems developed. It might be tempting to assign the major blame to certain individuals and point out ways in which they have not done their jobs adequately. While some of this is inevitable under the circumstances, a more productive approach might be to examine some of the general aspects of the situation on our campus that have brought us to this point.

The University Faculty must be willing to examine the extent to which it may be to blame for some of these problems. We made a commitment to minority education several years ago but our effectiveness in supporting and developing the program may not be what it should be in order to allow it to change with changing times in our society. There are some faculty members who have given of their time and efforts in regard to the program but other pressing professional needs may have caused many of us to ignore the commitment made toward minority education. This is a form of benign neglect on the part of many and it may well be more than that on the part of others. Some of the comments made to the evaluation team referred to problems in communication as well as to problems of general receptivity on the part of some faculty toward the program. The alarming aspect of this relates to the perception on the part of some that the problem is more one of receptivity than one of communication.

Problems of communication are not uncommon in relation to many situations on our campus. These are problems, however, that can be solved if we are all willing to make the effort to recognize the problems and do something about them. Communication is a two-way process and those in the minority program must also be willing to accept their share of the responsibility for lack of communication. Through mutual recognition of such responsibility, improvements in communication can be affected.

In regard to receptivity, each faculty member must examine his or her conscience about this. Problems will continue to exist if the faculty does not make good on the commitment that we made.

There is also the problem of a general attitude that we may have about the EOP Program. The faculty is the guardian of standards and integrity in all programs. Through its governance structure, the faculty functions to discharge this responsibility by insisting on sound curricular decisions in relation to programs and the individuals who implement the programs. In the past, it may have served a useful purpose to regard standards associated with minority education programs in a different way than standards associated with traditional programs at the university. Unfortunately, this kind of attitude can be viewed



(continued)

as being "paternalistic" and it ultimately works against the success of students in the program. In its worst interpretation, it can be viewed as a form of "racism," even though those who exercise a paternalistic approach may have the best of intentions. We owe it to all of our students, minority or otherwise, to provide programs that prepare them for productive futures. They expect no less from us.

Administrators have the responsibility to see that programs are administered in a competent and effective fashion. Each administrator must be accountable for those who report to him or her and see that they are properly discharging their responsibilities. This requires diligence and awareness and depends upon effective lines of communication. Administrators must respond to all information made available to them and be effective in anticipating potential problems. This is not an easy task but it is essential if we are to retain the confidence of the public that we serve.

In relation to the EOP situation, the team is concerned that our administration has not been effective in anticipating and dealing with potential problems. This is due to the same essential causes previously described. There is an apparent lack of effective communication within the administrative hierarchy in relation to this program. While it may not be accurate, some individuals with whom the team visited expressed the view that the problem of receptivity also exists with the administration. The team also perceives a major cause of problems to be the application of different standards and expectations on the part of the administration toward the EOP program and staff. The team views this as "paternalism" which needs to be effectively changed if problems are to be resolved. While some have interpreted this attitude as "racism" the team feels that it is more a matter of seemingly good intentions that are inappropriate. The ultimate resolution of these problems will require a unified and cooperative effort on the part of the faculty, the administration, and the EOP staff to provide effective leadership at all levels. It is a challenge for all of us. Hopefully, the report and its recommendations will provide the needed framework to bring about significant changes that will enhance the program.

#### Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge certain individuals in regard to this evaluation.

I wish to express my appreciation to Norris Hart and his staff for their cooperation in supplying information and being available for consultation in relation to this evaluation.

Also, I appreciate the cooperation of Jim Martin, John Kamerick, and others in the administration, for their support of this effort and their availability.

Dean Glenn Hansen has also been of great assistance as have been members of his staff, particularly Charlotte Kittgers. So have Donna Cornils, Vice President Martin's secretary, and Don Greene and his staff in Printing Services.

We are also appreciative of Paul Kelso and Bob Kramer in the Office of Student Research for their considerable effort in preparing the reports on student achievement and opinion.

I also wish to express my appreciation to my fellow faculty members, many of our students as well as the leadership of UNISA, and members of the Waterloo black community who assisted us by participating in this effort.

I want to express a special thanks to the evaluation team members who made my task much easier than it might have been. I have learned a great deal from them.



Senator Sandstrom indicated that he had three questions:

1. Is the team in agreement to the conclusions? Dr. Carter responded in the affirmative.
2. Are the impressions that the charges made unfounded? Dr. Carter indicated that the team did not address the charges. He indicated the team looked at ways to improve the program and its effectiveness. He pointed out that they did an evaluation and not an investigation.
3. When is the final report anticipated? Dr. Carter responded that it should be ready in a very short time contingent only on the responses made to this draft report.

Senator Hallberg asked who would be making reactions to the draft report. Dr. Carter indicated that some documents may appear to be one-sided. The draft report allows other sides to comment and to provide the team with information they had not received. Chairperson Davis indicated that the draft report will be given to Dr. Martin for the response.

Senator Duea asked if the draft report would also be going to the Faculty Senate and to UNISA. Chairperson Davis responded in the negative. He indicated that the report is a working draft of the evaluation team. What they have created is an internal document.

Vice President Martin asked Dr. Carter if everyone on the team had seen the draft. Dr. Carter responded that they had seen parts but not all of it. Dr. Martin asked if this draft was similar to an accreditation draft which goes to the members seeking minor corrections or additions. Dr. Carter responded in the affirmative. Senator Remington asked if the final report would be ready next week and if it would be circulated to all members of the Senate, to the administration, and to UNISA, at the same time. Dr. Carter responded by saying that the final report should be done very soon, and that when it is completed he will send one copy directly to Professor Rider. Dr. Rider indicated that as soon as he receives the final report he will make copies and distribute them. Professor Lee Brown asked why the draft report was only being sent to Dr. Martin and not to other people who have stakes in this matter. Professor Rider indicated it was to protect the integrity of the process. He indicated that Dr. Martin could distribute it to those involved in the recommendations, and that these people will have the courtesy of seeing the report as it affects them. Dr. Carter indicated that the report is not written to be applicable to everyone. He indicated that the team is making unit recommendations and that the person in charge of the unit is the person most capable of responding to this draft report.

Senator Remington asked Professor Rider if the final document did or did not deal with personnel matters. Dr. Rider responded by saying that the report does not deal with individuals directly; he indicated the recommendations deal with functions as they relate to individuals.

Chairperson Davis thanked Dr. Carter and Dr. Rider for their presentation.



7. 321 262 Application for Emeritus Status!

Hollman moved, Story seconded that the Senate move into executive session. Motion passed.

Hollman moved, Glenn seconded that the Senate rise from executive session. Motion passed.

Duea moved, Erickson seconded that the Senate approve emeritus status for Professor of Teaching, Mary Ann Jackson. Motion passed.

It was moved and seconded to adjourn.

The Senate adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip L. Patton

These Minutes shall stand approved as published unless corrections or protests are filed with the Secretary of the Senate within two weeks of this date, Thursday, May 27, 1982.

# APPENDIX A



University of Northern Iowa

Office of the Registrar

Ondar Falls, Iowa 50614  
Telephone (319) 273-2241

## 1981-1982 COMMITTEE ON ADMISSION AND RETENTION MEMBERSHIP

TO: Professor Darrel Davis, Chair  
University Faculty Senate

FROM: Juanita Wright, Chair  
Committee on Admission and Retention  
Philip L. Patton, Secretary

SUBJECT: 1981 Committee Annual Report

DATE: April 28, 1982

Attached is the annual report of the Committee on Admission and Retention for the calendar year 1981. The format is statistical in nature and is similar in style to previous reports to the University Faculty Senate.

A major change in Committee operations occurred as a result of Senate action on May 11, 1981. As you are aware, based on legal opinions, recommendation of the Educational Policies Commission and Senate action, the Committee no longer determines who shall be placed on academic warning, probation or suspension. These actions are taken by the Registrar or his/her designate following criteria established by the Faculty and as published in the University catalog. The Committee now reviews and acts on applications for readmission and on appeals of denial of admission to the university. These changes in operation now ensure compliance with due process considerations.

The Committee operated under these guidelines with the review of students records at the end of spring, summer, and fall 1981. We have found these new procedures to be effective and judicious.

The Committee would ask the Senate's indulgence in one area. Since the Committee has responsibility over university admission standards as well as university academic disciplinary standards and actions, the Committee would request that their input be sought in matters which deal with the overall admission standards of the university. The Committee would gladly volunteer their time and expertise to consider matters affecting admission to the university such as grade point averages, class ranks, course requirements, etc. Your consideration of this offer is appreciated.

Representatives of the Committee will be available at your meeting to discuss this report and answer any questions you may have. We therefore submit to the University Faculty Senate for consideration this Annual Report of the Committee on Admission and Retention.

Member	Area of Representation
Janice Abel	Office of Academic Advising
Ken Baughman	College of Humanities and Fine Arts
Jackson Baty	College of Education
Yancy Beavers	Financial Aids
Fred Carver	College of Education
David Duncan	College of Natural Sciences
Richard Hansen	College of Social & Behavioral Science
Paul Kelso	Office of Student Research
Fred Lott	Office of Academic Affairs
Clifford McCollum	College of Natural Sciences
Robert Morin	College of Social & Behavioral Science
Philip Patton	Office of the Registrar
Jack Reed	School of Business
Larry Routh	Counseling Center
Tony Stevens	Educational Opportunity Program
Thomas Thompson	College of Humanities & Fine Arts
Ira Tolbert	Educational Opportunity Program
Robert Waller	School of Business
Jack Wielenga	Office of Admissions
Juanita Wright	Educational Opportunity Program



## (APPENDIX A cont.)

## COMMITTEE ON ADMISSION AND RETENTION

## Explanation of Tables

TABLE I

Indefinite suspension is for no specific period, but readmission is not usually granted before the student has been out of college for at least one academic semester. Students under academic suspension must apply for readmission. Some students are permitted immediate readmission provided the cause of deficient performance has been removed and successful performance can be assumed. All percents refer to the total undergraduate student body.

Read the first line like this: In the fall semester 1968, 3.1% of the student body began the semester on a warning, at the end of which 1.1% had the warning cancelled, 1.3% had it continued, and enough more received warnings to bring the total at the end of the semester to 7.1%. Read the probationations in the same way.

TABLE II

Grade indices are expressed in quartiles for each undergraduate classification and for all undergraduates.

TABLE III

This table shows the actual number of students placed into the warning, probation, and suspension categories for 1979. It also shows the action taken on applications for readmission for 1979. The awarding of 7C, 7K and 9K categories were discontinued as of May 11, 1979.

TABLE I  
PERCENT OF UNDERGRADUATES  
INVOLVED IN WARNINGS, PROBATIONS, OR SUSPENSIONS

SEMESTERS	WARNINGS		PROBATIONS		WARNINGS		PROBATIONS		SUSPENSIONS
	During Sem	At End of Sem	During Sem	At End of Sem	Canc	Cont	Rmvd	Cont	
FALL									
1968	3.1	7.1	9.8	10.5	1.1	1.3	2.6	5.7	3.56
1969	2.9	7.6	8.8	9.2	1.0	1.4	1.7	4.3	2.05
1970	3.0	7.0	7.2	5.5	1.0	1.4	2.1	4.1	1.15
1971	4.2	7.3	4.7	3.6	1.8	1.8	1.2	2.5	0.89
1972	3.4	6.0	4.3	4.5	1.4	1.4	1.2	2.8	0.48
1973	2.7	6.4	4.4	5.7	0.9	1.3	1.1	3.0	0.39
1974	2.8	6.6	4.4	5.3	1.0	1.3	0.9	2.9	1.20
1975	3.2	7.7	5.1	6.7	1.0	1.3	0.5	3.6	2.25
1976	3.3	6.8	4.8	5.1	1.2	1.4	1.1	2.8	1.90
1977	2.7	7.5	4.1	5.4	1.0	1.1	0.5	2.8	1.28
1978	3.5	7.9	4.5	5.8	1.2	1.5	0.7	2.8	1.62
1979	4.0	7.2	4.6	5.1	1.6	1.3	0.9	2.5	2.41
1980	3.8	7.6	4.9	5.0	1.4	1.6	1.0	2.8	2.20
1981	3.7	7.7	4.2	4.2	1.5	1.4	0.8	2.2	2.21
SPRING									
1968	7.9	4.7	10.7	10.9	2.2	2.4	2.4	6.2	5.42
1969	6.6	3.9	10.7	8.9	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.3	3.60
1970	7.2	4.2	9.9	7.4	3.3	2.6	?	1.7	1.20
1971	6.5	6.3	6.7	3.2	2.8	2.5	2.2	2.1	1.45
1972	6.8	4.9	4.2	3.6	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.7	0.87
1973	5.6	3.9	4.8	3.8	2.6	2.2	1.0	3.0	1.19
1974	5.6	3.8	5.2	3.9	2.7	1.9	0.7	3.0	2.47
1975	6.0	5.1	5.8	5.3	2.2	2.5	0.8	3.4	2.16
1976	6.9	5.3	6.7	6.0	2.5	2.6	1.1	4.0	2.76*
1977	6.2	4.8	5.2	5.1	2.3	2.3	0.7	3.3	2.44*
1978	7.1	5.5	5.4	5.6	2.3	2.7	0.6	3.3	3.23*
1979	7.3	5.7	5.7	4.7	2.6	3.0	0.7	3.0	2.60*
1980	6.9	5.6	6.0	4.9	2.3	2.9	1.0	3.1	2.96
1981	7.0	5.4	5.4	4.3	2.9	2.6	0.8	2.7	2.97
SUMMER									
1968	2.6	2.2	13.2	10.7	0.9	1.0	3.2	2.3	1.96
1969	2.2	2.6	11.9	8.6	0.9	1.0	3.1	1.6	1.48
1970	1.9	2.0	8.6	6.5	0.7	0.9	2.7	1.1	0.56
1971	4.5	5.2	5.4	3.2	2.0	2.4	0.7	3.0	0.47
1972	3.2	2.9	5.0	3.8	1.6	1.5	1.0	3.5	0.46
1973	2.3	2.7	5.0	4.2	0.6	1.5	1.0	4.0	0.10
1974	1.9	1.7	3.4	2.9	0.7	0.8	0.6	2.6	0.22
1975	1.8	2.1	3.3	2.5	0.8	0.9	0.4	2.4	0.62
1976	2.8	3.2	5.4	4.3	1.3	1.3	1.0	3.9	1.19
1977	3.0	3.6	5.3	4.4	1.1	1.7	0.4	4.2	0.64
1978	3.3	3.5	5.8	5.2	1.2	1.9	0.6	4.7	0.90*
1979	2.9	3.9	4.6	3.5	1.0	1.5	0.9	3.1	0.76*
1980	2.4	2.5	3.4	2.7	0.9	1.3	0.5	2.4	0.47
1981	3.3	3.9	5.1	4.0	1.2	2.0	0.7	3.9	0.46

\*Includes those eligible for immediate readmission

## (APPENDIX A cont.)

TABLE II  
UNDERGRADUATE GRADE INDICES AT THE END  
OF FALL SEMESTERS

	Quartiles	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
All Under-graduates	Q3	3.18	3.27	3.33	3.33	3.31	3.29	3.25	3.29	3.27	3.29	3.26
	M	2.73	2.82	2.92	2.86	2.79	2.77	2.75	2.75	2.73	2.79	2.75
	Q1	2.25	2.29	2.43	2.25	2.18	2.22	2.17	2.14	2.10	2.17	2.14
Seniors	Q3	3.38	3.50	3.55	3.56	3.53	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.47
	M	3.00	3.13	3.20	3.17	3.15	3.08	3.09	3.08	3.00	3.00	3.00
	Q1	2.63	2.67	2.85	2.73	2.67	2.56	2.53	2.53	2.43	2.53	2.50
Juniors	Q3	3.24	3.35	3.38	3.44	3.42	3.38	3.38	3.38	3.36	3.36	3.33
	M	2.85	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.94	2.93	2.94	2.87	2.92	2.88	2.85
	Q1	2.41	2.50	2.57	2.54	2.44	2.26	2.41	2.33	2.27	2.33	2.31
Sophomores	Q3	3.08	3.20	3.30	3.27	3.33	3.27	3.24	3.28	3.27	3.31	3.25
	M	2.67	2.77	3.00	2.82	2.87	2.78	2.75	2.80	2.75	2.83	2.77
	Q1	2.25	2.27	2.43	2.25	2.29	2.27	2.25	2.24	2.19	2.31	2.23
Freshmen	Q3	2.93	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.06	3.00	3.00	2.94	3.00	3.00
	M	2.44	2.47	2.57	2.50	2.44	2.53	2.47	2.42	2.42	2.47	2.46
	Q1	2.06	2.00	2.23	1.93	1.87	2.00	2.00	1.92	1.88	1.92	1.92

TABLE III  
STUDENT PROBATIONS, WARNINGS, AND SUSPENSIONS

	X	0	2C	3A	3C	8C	9	Total
Spring 1981	338	492	8	141	164	77	271	1491
Summer 1981	49	103	3	4	49	49	12	269
Fall 1981	208	750	17	201	138	81	215	1610

ACTIONS ON APPLICATIONS FOR READMISSION  
(1/1/81 through 12/31/81)

	Readmits*	Denials
Spring 1981	73	24
Summer 1981	29	14
Fall 1981	89	25
TOTALS	191	63

\*Includes immediate readmissions

## Codes:

X	Removed from academic probation
0	Warning
1	Probation (Transfer probation given at time of admission)
2	Probation (Transfer probation given at time of admission)
2C	Continued on probation (transfer probation)
3A	Placed on academic probation
3C	Continued on probation (3A changes to 3C when the student is eligible to return after one semester under 3A)
8C	Probation readmission after suspension
9	Academic suspension